

will be many paths of difficulty requiring courage and grit and sacrifice, we will travel through the century in the constant company of a true and great friend.

May God bless the peoples of America and Australia.

[Applause, Members rising.]

At 11:00 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m., the Prime Minister of Australia, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1456

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 10 one-minutes per side.

MARRIAGE PENALTY

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to stand in strong support of the American family by once and for all permanently

eliminating the multibillion-dollar tax on the sanctity of marriage. If we fail to act, married couples in my home State of Montana will be hit with more than \$150 million in increased taxes every year.

Mr. Speaker, the words "I do" that are exchanged between married couples should be a pledge to build a strong family and achieve their own slice of the American pie. It should not be a forced commitment to paying higher taxes to the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to send a clear message that this Congress stands with the American family by voting for the permanent repeal of the marriage penalty.

PLAN TO PRIVATIZE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, on June 4 of this year, the administration amended executive order 13180 dated 12/7/2000 by amending the language that deemed air traffic control as an inherently governmental function. This is the first step toward privatization of air traffic control, and it is a slap in the face to our Nation's wonderful air traffic controllers.

On 9/11 our air traffic controllers safely landed 5,000 planes in 2 hours without an error. They did an incredible job. What else must be done to prove that the current system that we have that is in place works well?

Mr. Speaker, I do not want my family or other Americans to board commercial airliners that the traffic in the sky is controlled by the lowest bidder. I think we have tried that with airline security and have clearly demonstrated without a shadow of a doubt that it does not work.

I rise today in opposition to this plan to privatize air traffic control.

ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY TAX

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this week we are going to bring up the elimination of the sunset clause for the marriage penalty tax.

Mr. Speaker, 120,000 individuals in my State, 60,000 married couples, are affected by this tax. If we allow this tax to come back, to rise from the dead one more time in the year 2010, we are going to do severe injustice to those 60,000 couples. Couples are going to end up paying \$1,300, \$1,400 more in tax simply because they are married. This is an unjust and unfair clause, and we must eliminate the sunset clause so that this tax remains buried once and for all. We cannot afford to have our married couples deciding whether or

not they should remain married over paying a tax.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Trade Adjustment Assistant Compromise based on legislation that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) and I introduced in the House and which passed the Senate last month. This compromise represents the first major overhaul of this 40-year-old program. For the first time in our history, a health care benefit is provided for unemployed workers as a result of trade. It increases eligibility, it doubles funding for worker training, it harmonizes the NAFTA TAA, it expands income support from 52 weeks to 78 weeks, and it allows for shifts in production to any country, not just Canada or Mexico.

□ 1500

I want to tell a quick story that underscores this point. Last month 3,300 electronic workers who were laid off from JDS Uniphase in my region were denied TAA benefits because their factory moved to China. At the same time workers in Connecticut were eligible for TAA because their plant moved to Canada, and that is because workers only receive TAA benefits if their plant moves to Canada or Mexico.

Another problem with the program is that it covers workers who make cars but not those who make the parts that go into them. We need a 21st century policy on the duality of trade. We should have fair trade, and fair treatment should be the partners.

I urge all House Members to support this in the conference.

RESTRUCTURE AND EXPAND TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3670, the bill introduced by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and myself to restructure and expand the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. The other body has already adopted this legislation as part of the Trade Promotion Authority, and the House will soon vote to go to conference with the other body to work out a trade promotion authority bill. As one who supported TPA, who supported Fast Track, I believe it is imperative on the part of the House that we adopt the Senate's version of Trade Adjustment Assistance. If we are going to have a real trade package for this country, it has to benefit not just those who win from trade but those who lose from

trade as well, including the workers who lose their job through no fault of their own. We should have a full package which includes a revamp of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program for the first time since 1962 when it was created by the Kennedy Administration. So I hope that the leadership of the House, the Republican leadership, will have the wisdom if they really want to pass a TPA bill and proceed to the Senate for a real Trade Adjustment Assistance reform package.

PREVENTING CHILD ABDUCTIONS

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been getting up every day for the last several months and talking about Ludwig Koons who has been held in Italy illegally after being taken away from the United States of America, and by now we all know the name Elizabeth Smart, the young girl who was abducted from her bedroom in Salt Lake City, Utah. In light of the tragedy of her disappearance and on behalf of the Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus here in Congress, I would ask and send our prayers to Elizabeth and to her family, but I would also like to remind parents all across this country to talk to your kids about their personal safety, talk to them about the "Know the Rules" educational program put out by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. And I would urge every parent to log on to www.missingkids.com and learn what they can do to protect and educate their children.

Nearly 2,000 children are reported missing every day in the United States of America, and we all must be prepared as parents and grandparents to deal with the tragedy, should it occur. That means having updated quality photographs and knowing our children's height and weight. We should be aware that looking at pictures of missing kids brings them home and that we commit ourselves to looking at the photos we get in the mail or we see in a grocery store. If we all do our part, together we can prevent abductions and bring children like Elizabeth and like Ludwig Koons home where they belong.

PRIVATIZATION OF U.S. AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, A BAD IDEA

(Mr. HOLDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the idea of privatizing the United States air traffic control system has been given a renewed life. Mr. Speaker, that would be a very bad idea. A competent and reliable air traffic control system is vital to the safety of our flying public, and public safety is a re-

sponsibility of the Government. Simply put, air traffic controllers perform an inherently governmental function for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of privatizing air traffic controllers like to cite three countries they consider to be successful examples of privatization: Australia, Great Britain, and Canada. Unless we consider a walkout, a pending bankruptcy and a pending labor strike to be examples of success, I would respectfully disagree. Let us face the fact that privatization of air traffic control does not work.

On September 11 of last year, air traffic controllers proved their worth as inherently governmental employees. Our air traffic control system is the envy of the world. Let us keep it that way.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4775, 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4775) making supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to H.R. 4775 be instructed to insist, for each item directly related to the war on terrorism or homeland security, on the higher dollar amount in either the House bill or the Senate amendment and to disagree to any item that appropriates additional funds earmarked for a specific project not related to the war on terrorism or homeland security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to instruct conferees directs the House Members serving on the conference to convert what has been all too often merely a rhetorical assault on terrorism into a real war. It requires that we go to the higher dollar figure on any item directly related to the war on terrorism, and it also directs that we delete from

the conference report funding for any item that is earmarked for a specific project or individual Member of Congress. That is to ensure that this supplemental remains focused on the job before us, fighting terrorism, and that those engaged in that war on behalf of the American people have the resources that they need to conduct that war.

I find that ordinary people are somewhat amazed when they find that, despite all the rhetoric about a war on terrorism, we often continue to decline to provide the resources needed to actually conduct that effort. One example is the fact that the Pentagon called up 80,000 Guard and Reservists following September 11.

We need those Reserves because our regular force is overwhelmed with all of the requirements being placed on them. If you do not believe me, Secretary Rumsfeld has made that statement. We do not have enough mechanics to keep all of our planes in the air, we do not have enough MPs to protect our bases and guard prisoners. But, remarkably, when the Pentagon told the White House budget office that it would cost \$5.8 billion more than was contained in the regular fiscal 2003 appropriation bill to pay the cost of those Guards and Reservists called up to active duty, the White House budget office told them they could only have \$4.1 billion. As a result, many of those reserves will have to be sent home early, unless we appropriate a considerable amount above the White House request. In my view, this is ludicrous. It is one of those situations that continues because it is so outrageous that nobody really believes it is going on.

The truth is that some of the same people at the other end of the avenue who give lectures about the war on terrorism, particularly in the OMB, are particularly stingy when it comes to providing cash that is actually needed to conduct the effort. As a result, the resources needed by those who are actually engaged in that effort are not getting there and will not get there unless Congress acts to reverse the request.

I would give the House another example. We have heard a lot of talk in the last several days about a dirty bomb. The President and Secretary of Energy, a former Republican Senator, a man named to that office by the President and confirmed by the Senate when it was still in Republican hands, a man respected on both sides of the aisle, Secretary Abraham, has asked that we spend some money in this bill to deny terrorists access to the radioactive materials that could be used to build a dirty bomb. He asked that we clean up sites where we used to make nuclear weapons and increase security at those sites. He asked that we relocate low level radioactive materials in a central depository. He asked that we provide more security for the movement of nuclear weapons.

This the White House Budget Director did not say no to, they said "hell,